Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 20-38 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2.   Applicant argues that the newly added limitations of *"modifying the at least one*

message by adding address information to and deleting address information from

the at least one message."

3.   In light of Applicant recent amendments, Examiner withdraws previous rejections.

However, an additional search is performed and the results are utilized in the action

below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

5.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6.   Claims 20-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Rosenberg (NPL titled: Supporting Intermediary Session Policies in SIP) in view of

Pirttimaa et al (US Patent 7,574,735).

Regarding claim 20 and 38, Rosenberg discloses a call set-up system to set-up

calls across packet switching network (Proxy servers) (page 1-Abstract, page 3-

paragraph 1,) connected to each other by network address translation (NAT) devices ,

comprising a plurality of call agents configured to send and receive messages to and

from other call agents (see Fig. 2, page 3–paragraph 1, page 5, paragraph 2, 3 & 5,

page 24-Fig. 6, paragraph 1, 2 & 3), the messages including address information for

media packets within the packet-switched networks to define a media path of the call

(Fig. 1 & 5, page 3-paragraph 5, page 5-paragraph 1, page 6-last paragraph, page 8-

paragraph 4, page 12-paragraph 2 & 3, page 15-last paragraph) wherein at least one of

the messages includes address information sent to a preceding call agent involved in

the set-up of the call (Fig. 3, 5,& 6, page 1-paragraph 1).

Although Rosenberg is silent on "***modifying the at least one message by***

adding address information to and deleting address information from the at least

one message," Pirttimaa et al discloses user agent receiving/adding and extracting

address information from SIP message (see figure 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the

time of the invention to be motivated to implement modifying the at least one message

by adding address information to and deleting address information from the at least one

message as taught by Pirttimaa et al with the teachings of Rosenberg for the purpose of

further supporting coherent SIP communication between multiple users.

7.   Claims 21-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Rosenberg (NPL titled: Supporting Intermediary Session Policies in SIP) in view of

Pirttimaa et al (US Patent 7,574,735) as applied to claims 20 and 38 above, and further

in view of Harris (2004/0114590).

Regarding claim 21 and 22, claims 21 and 22 contain all the limitations of claim

20 except for scanning received messages. Harris discloses querying/searching

received call setup messages (see Fig. 1, 2 and 5, paragraph, 0008, 0054 and 0106)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the

time of the invention to be motivated to implement querying/searching received call

setup messages as taught by Harris with the teachings of Rosenberg for the purpose of

further supporting coherent SIP communication between multiple users.

Regarding claim 23,   Rosenberg further discloses a call set-up system of claim

22 wherein a media path opened through a NAT device for re-entry to a network is

closed (page 3, paragraph 1, Rosenberg discloses closing media pinholes via rerouting

to network).

  Regarding claim 24, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 20

wherein one or more of the messages include session descriptions (page 3-paragraph

4, page 4-paragraph 5).

  Regarding claim 25, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 20

wherein at least one message includes encrypted address information (page 4,

paragraph 2).

  Regarding claim 26, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim

20 wherein at least one message includes a reference to address information stored

within the plurality of packet-switched networks (page 1, Abstract, page 8-paragraph 4,

page 11, line 1-5).

  Regarding claim 27, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 20

wherein at least one message includes an identifier of a packet-switched network that

media packets are to traverse (page 5-paragraph 2, page 7, paragraph 3, page 13-

paragraph 2).

Regarding claim 28, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 27 wherein each of the plurality of packet-switched networks has a globally unique identifier (page 13-paragraph 1).

Regarding claim 29, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 20 wherein the call agents are configured to format the messages according to an offer/answer protocol (page 14-paragraph 2, 3 and 4).

Regarding claim 30, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 29 wherein the offer/answer protocol is Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) (page 10-paragraph 10, page 14-paragraph 2, 3 and 40).

Regarding claim 31, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 30 wherein the address information for media packets is sent to the call agents involved in the call-set up in a stack structure as a multipart attachment to the SIP message (page 13-paragraph 2 & 3).

Regarding claim 32, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 31 wherein if the stack structure includes an entry for the region being entered by the message, the call agent receiving the message is configured to scan the stack structure and to make the oldest matching entry the new session description (page 11 and 14) .

Regarding claim 33, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 32 wherein the call agent receiving the message is further configured to close a pinhole opened in a NAT device associated with the region being entered by the message(page 3, 6, 15, 19).

Regarding claim 34, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 32 wherein if the stack structure does not include an entry for the region being left by an answer message, the call agent sending the message is configured to close a pinhole in a NAT device associated with that region (page 3-paragraph 1).

Regarding claim 35, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 20 wherein the call agents are arranged to control the NAT devices (page 3-paragraph 1).

Regarding claim 36, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 35 wherein are the call agents are incorporated in the NAT devices (Fig. 2, page 19).

Regarding claim 37, Rosenberg further discloses call set-up system of claim 20 wherein at least one of the packet-switched networks comprises a 3G radio network (page 3-paragraph 2).

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Prenell P. Jones whose telephone number is 571-272-

3180. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hassan Phillips can be reached on 571-272-3940. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Prenell P. Jones

March 20, 2011

/Prenell P Jones/

Examiner, Art Unit 2467

/HASSAN PHILLIPS/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2467